Conservative vs. Liberal Catholics.

A young clergyman in the Northwest, in sending us his subscription the other day, added these lines:

"Would it not be a very good idea (I am sure it would be hailed by many readers of THE REVIEW) to devote, at your convenience, a few lines to explaining the difference between the 'Conservatives' and 'Liberals,' as existing in the Catholic Church of America? For a young priest such a clarification, if impartial, of Catholic parties, good and loyal, as both claim to be, would be a boon and make it possible for him to be quite at home on topics that seem to embroil and agitate certain leaders self-constituted."

An answer to the request of our reverend correspondent must be tantamount to a description of "Americanism;" and the fact that he makes it at this late date shows that he has not been a careful reader of THE REVIEW during the famous controversy that led to the papal Brief "Testem benevolentiae."

"Americanism" is the modern form of Liberalism. It is not easy to define Liberalism, because it is a very peculiar heresy, inasmuchas it does not deny or distortany well-defined Catholic truth or any order of truths, but rests upon an utterly false conception of the entire system of Catholic doctrine and practice. The "Liberal Catholic" (really a *contradictio in terminis*) denies no particular dogma, and is therefore armed against the criticisms of what he is pleased to call a "supersensitive Conservatism"; but he dilutes and weakens them all. While he is aware that the Syllabus (Prop. 80) declares that the Church can never reconcile herself to the modern ideas of progress and civilization, in a word to Liberalism; he does not consider the Syllabus a decision binding upon all Catholics. Besides, as a "Liberal Catholic," he does not champion absolute Liberalism, but only a modern form thereof—the "true" and "genuine" Liberalism. He admits the plenary powers of the highest ecclesiastical authority, but at the same time does his level best to limit the exercise thereof and to weaken the import of its pronouncements and decisions, wherever his notion of the (in his opinion) necessary "reconciliation" of the Church and the age requires it. He is "Catholic," "genuinely Catholic," even more Catholic than the Pope upon occasions, and solemnly professes that he considers the Catholic religion the only true faith; all of which does not, however, prevent him from advocating enthusiastically the "reform" or "evolution" of Cathol-

(The Review, Vol. IX, No. 31. St. Louis, Mo., August 7, 1902.)

icism demanded by the Zeitgeist, so long as what he arbitrarily considers "essential" is preserved. His ideal is a "rational communism," which is to become "the ultimate religion" of the future. No one surpasses him in enthusiastic praise of the papacy and the ruling Pope; at the same time, however, he saves himself the trouble of building up his politico-religious system on the instructions and rulings of the Pontiff.

Thus the error is practical rather than theoretical; elusive as a doctrine, but all the more dangerous in practice. It has its own method of interpreting, distinguishing, and explaining the truths of the faith, even at the risk, as Leo XIII. remarks, of evaporating them altogether. It is consequently a difficult, if not impossible, undertaking to express the essence of this system in a definite, brief, and concrete formula. One of the coryphaei of Americanism has characterized it in connection with the teachings of Father Hecker in an article in the *Catholic World* Magazine as "the synthesis of progress and Catholicity." Others have repeatedly declared it to be the enlightened progress of the Church befitting our age and country. This definition not only decribes, but also condemns Americanism. For the theory on which it is based expects the Church to renounce, if not in principle, at least in fact, her mission towards society as such; and amounts, therefore, at bottom, to a practical denial of the social kingdom of Christ and His Church.

St. Cyprian said of certain heretics of his day: "*Rem divinam humanam faciunt*," i. e., they treat divine things, that is to say, divine truths and institutions, as if they were human. The essence of "Americanism" or Liberalism can not, in our opinion, be more profoundly or more luminously expressed. It mixes up and confuses the order of nature with that of grace, by narrowing down the limits of the supernatural order; by withdrawing society as such, the State and public life in general, as far as possible from the influence of revealed religion; by limiting and weakening the import of supernatural truths and their binding force; by carrying its own onesided views into the field of religion and thus practically degrading the Church to the rôle of a purely natural and purely human society which must progress with, and receive instruction and enlightenment from, the Zeitgeist—the Spirit of the Age.

A careful perusal of the Brief "Testem benevolentiae" will convince our friend that this is Liberalism in the clear white light of Catholic truth, as reflected through the Vicar of Christ himself.

Those Catholics who are, in contradistinction, called Conservatives hold, on the other hand, that the Church, as the faithful custodian of the divine deposit of the faith, can not meet the Zeitgeist

but as an enemy whose encroachments and attacks it is her sacred duty to ward off and repulse; an enemy who, in the name of pseudo-science, would make reason the teacher of revelation; who, on the plea of a false liberty, refuses to recognize the sovereign power of the Redeemer and His Church over the minds and hearts of all men; who cultivates a "progress" which takes no account of the true dignity and destiny of the human race.

"We ask," says Pope Pius IX., "all those who invite us, for the best of religion, to reconcile ourselves to modern progress: Are the facts such as to induce the Vicar of Christ, who is charged with keeping pure the divine doctrine, without grievous violation of conscience and great scandal to approach a spirit which has caused so many deplorable evils and spread so many false views, errors, and principles directy contradicting the Catholic faith?" (Allocution "Jamdudum," March 18th, 1861.)

Can any Catholic seek the mission of the Church in the solution of problems which the supreme authority has so clearly pronounced to be insoluble?

As against Liberalism, we who are styled "conservative" Catholics, but who are really CATHOLICS *sans phrase*, see our special task, in these piping days of twentieth-century rationalism, in drawing closer than ever to the infallible magisterium of our Holy Church, and in taking a hand, according to our individual abilities, in the battle she has waged for ages, and is now waging as energetically as ever, against the dangerous attacks of a Zeitgeist who would change the solemn exhortation of St. Paul: "*Nolite conformari huic saeculo*," into synthesizing "modern progress," so-called, and Catholicity, which can no more be combined than light and darkness, faith and unbelief, virtue, and vice,—no more than Eternal Truth and error.

Some Judicial Aspects of the Friar Question.

SIDNEY WEBSTER has recently pointed out in the New York *Herald* [July 27th] that the main questions involved in the Philippine friar controversy "are judicial rather than political, ecclesiastical or diplomatic," because of the Paris treaty.

Maintenance and protection of the free enjoyment of property and religion have been the commonplace stipulations of all our treaties. Freedom of conscience, religion, belief, and worship have therein been elementary reciprocal privileges. The Spanish treaty added nothing to what would have been their rights had our constitution gone *proprio vigore*, or in any other way, into the ceded islands. The priests of any nationality could have exercised their profession in the new islands, so long as they conformed to constitutional laws regulating all aliens. The Pope could appoint bishops and priests in Manila, as in New York or Boston, subject to the law of our own land.

As to the obnoxious friars—concede them to be aliens. That they are priests is immaterial. If the alien and sedition laws of 1798 were constitutional, Congress can authorize the President to expel the friars if they are proved dangerous to the public peace and safety. It is the duty of aliens in our jurisdiction to be obedient to the rightful authority of the government. If the friars are not, then plainly they can in the Philippines be now subjected, by order of the President, to military restraint, like other persons, provided an insurrection exists, and "military necessity" requires the restraint.

The claim made by the Catholic Church and its religious orders to lands and other realty in the Philippines, and a refusal by the authorities of the Church and those orders to withdraw from the archipelago religious who are Spanish subjects, would present again questions debated in the Supreme Court insular cases.

Is the archipelago now, even if it was not when the Court decided those cases, incorporated into, and become an integral part of, the United States? What has been the influence in that direction of recent legislation? Does, or does not, the constitution now control in the Philippines? Is the President subject to it, in dealing with the problem of church property and of the friars, or is the archipelago in that "transition period" referred to by administration justices in the insular cases, during which period the constitution does not prevail?

A majority of the justices said in the insular cases that the

treaty with Spain did not, and could not, without an enabling vote of Congress, incorporate the Philippines into the United States. Has that enabling vote yet been given?

Upon the true answer to questions like these depend important limitations upon the power of President Roosevelt, as Commander-in-Chief of the army, and his agents in the Philippines, whether military or civil, to deal with the Church lands and the friars.

If the Philippines have been incorporated into the United States, and the constitution there bears sway, then neither the President nor Congress can, without "just compensation," deprive anybody, whether citizen or alien, Catholic or Protestant, churchman, Mohammedan or heretic, of vested rights of property.

The question of right is a judicial question, but has Congress established courts competent to try the question? It is doubtful.

The precise questions presented by the eighth article of the Spanish treaty have probably never before arisen in our country, for, although in the area governed by the cessions made by Mexico the Catholic Church once held a vast extent of mission lands, they had previously been secularized by Mexico as a State.

The Spanish treaty of 1898 ceded to the United States, by the opening sentence of the eighth article, all the "immovable property" belonging to the crown of Spain, and then went on to exempt from that cession and from impairment all property or rights which, "by law," belong to "provinces, municipalities, ecclesiastical or civic bodies, or any other associations having legal capacity to acquire and possess, etc., or belong to private individuals of whatever nationality."

Did any of the lands in dispute belong to the public domain and the crown of Spain? Land claims in California were by Congress referred to a commission, with right of appeal from its decision to the Supreme Court.

It is quite possible the American negotiators had their thoughts so intently fixed on circumventing the federal constitution by the last very novel clause of the ninth article of the treaty, stipulating for congressional supremacy over the natives of the ceded islands, that those negotiators omitted to appreciate the full effect of the antecedent stipulations of that ninth article which permitted any "obnoxious friars" (natives of the peninsula) to remain Spanish subjects and have the rights of aliens, which were to be superior, so far as concerned Congress, to the rights of native Filipinos.

All the Spanish friars are now under the protection of public law, international law and our federal constitution (whatever the last may in these days be worth), which protection, it is said, the natives of the archipelago have not.

The American negotiators could, but they did not, have con-

strained their Spanish colleagues to stipulate that the property rights of the Church and the personal rights of the "friars" in the Philippines "will be determined by the Congress."

It is not to be lightly assumed that either President Roosevelt (if the constitution is now inoperative in the Philippines) or Spain or the Vatican will be unreasonable in the matter. But if the archipelago has been incorporated, then the constitution shows an orderly way to preserve the treaty, the temporal rights of the two contracting powers and the spiritual rights of His Holiness the Pope.

The Fundamental Error of Modern Democracy.

THE opinion prevails quite generally that the fourteenth amendment to the Federal Constitution has fastened upon us the pernicious doctrine of universal and equal suffrage.

Mr. William L. Scruggs, who is an authority on political and legal subjects and a close student of constitutional questions, calls this a misconception, which arises mainly from the clause which prohibits any State from enacting or enforcing "any law abridging the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States." The words "privileges and immunities" did not come into the Constitution with the fourteenth amendment. They had been there (in Article IV.) eighty years before that amendment was ever dreamed of. And our courts had uniformly held that they did not relate to suffrage at all, but only to private rights; that suffrage was not a natural right incident to citizenship, but a gift conferred by the State. The clause in the fourteenth amendment, merely adds a guarantee for the protection of the citizen in the exercise of his natural or so-called private rights.

The only clause in the fourteenth amendment that bears upon the question of suffrage is in section two, which relates to the apportionment of representatives among the several States. The apportionment is based on population. This is mandatory. Then follows the contingent proposition that when "the right to vote" is denied by the State to resident male citizens of the United States, twenty-one years of age, except for "crime," the basis of representation shall be reduced in the proportion which the

number of such citizens bears to the whole number of resident male citizens over that age. But whence comes this "right to vote"? Not being a born right incident to citizenship, it can be conferred only by State laws. None but qualified electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature can be legal voters at national elections. So the question of suffrage is still with the State, where it had always been.

Nor does the fifteenth amendment, in Mr. Scruggs' opinion, change this. It declares merely that "the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged" by either State or nation, "on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude." But here, again, the question naturally arises, Whence comes "the right to vote"? And again the answer is: in the State, from State laws; in the territory, from a law of Congress. In no other way can it come. Hence the obvious meaning of the fifteenth amendment is that when the right to vote has been thus conferred, its exercise shall not be denied or abridged on account of the conditions named—it being still competent to the State (or to Congress, as the case may be), to declare that "when." In neither case is there any guarantee that the gift of the right to vote shall be conferred, or that, when conferred, it shall not be revocable. The only guarantee is exemption from certain specific discriminations; and this manifestly applies as well to any extension as to any restriction of the right of suffrage.*)

Mr. Scruggs, like all enlightened students of the problem, is heartily in favor of restricting the suffrage to "an impartial standard of intelligence, virtue, and personal responsibility,"—a thing which,—if his view is correct, as we believe,—each State can do without any violation of the Constitution.

Equal voting, as Mill †) has truly observed, "is in principle wrong." But it is not only wrong in the utilitarian signification, in which Mill used the word—inexpedient—but in a much deeper sense. It is wrong because it is contrary to the nature of things, because it is unjust. It is unjust to the classes, for it infringes their right as to persons to count in the community for what they are really worth; it is "tyrannously repressive of the better sort." It is unjust to the masses, for it infringes their right to the guidance of men of light and leading, and subjects them to a base oligarchy of vile political adventurers. It is unjust to the State, which it derationalizes, making it—to borrow a pregnant phrase of Green ‡)—"not the passionless expression of general right,

*) N. Y. *Independent*, No. 2799.
†) Considerations on Representative Government, p. 173.
‡) Works, III, p. 282.

but the engine of individual caprice, under alternate fits of appetite and fear."

In the United States it has, in the words of Mr. Scruggs, "degraded our politics, corrupted the ballot, lowered the tone of public morality, converted elections into mere farces, and rendered good government next to impossible."

Corruption is the great fact writ large on well-nigh every page of Mr. Bryce's standard volumes on the American Commonwealth, which are certainly not written in a spirit of hostility to American institutions. And, as Canon Barnett §) has truly pointed out, "the penalty"—one penalty—of that corruption is "written in the broken lives and bitter passions of the poor."

Henry George ||) is well warranted when he writes: "The experiment of popular government in the United States is clearly a failure. Speaking generally of the whole country....our government has, in large degree, become, is, in larger degree, becoming, government by the strong and unscrupulous.....In many cities the ordinary citizen has no more influence in the government under which he lives than he would have in China. He is, in reality, not one of the governing class, but of the governed. He occasionally, in disgust, votes for 'the other man,' or 'the other party,' but generally to find that he has effected only a change of masters, or secured the same masters under different names. And he is beginning to accept the situation and to leave politics to politicians, as something with which an honest, self-respecting man can not afford to meddle." How many are there among our readers who would refuse to subscribe to this statement?

Nor is the working of false democracy much better in France or England, as Mr. W. S. Lilly has proved in the chapter on "The Corruption of the State" in his admirable work 'First Principles in Politics,' and M. Benoist in his 'La Crise de l'État moderne.' Most truly has Professor von Sybel said, in his 'History of the Revolutionary Period,' that the Rousseauan theory, which is, so to speak, incarnate in the false democracy worshipped by so many of us here in America—and by some who ought to know better—"raises to the throne, not the reason which is common to all men, but the aggregate of universal passions."

"A primary lesson of physical science," declares Lilly ¶) "is the fact of the natural inequality of men, of races, of nations. A primary principle of political science is the inequality of right resulting from this fact. If men are unequal physically, morally,

---

§) *Fortnightly Review*, Aug. 1893.
||) Social Problems, p. 16.
¶) First Principles, p. 181-2.

intellectually, most clearly they should not be equal in the body politic."

To try to make them equal and to give them equal political rights, is to subvert the order of nature and to court disaster, which will surely overtake this nation if the grievous mistake is not soon remedied.

CONTEMPORARY CHRONICLE.

THE RELIGIOUS WORLD.

Frame Churches Can Not be Consecrated.—In reply to a *dubium* of the Bishop of San Salvador in Central America, the S. Congregation of Rites has recently decided that a church built of wood can not be consecrated according to the Roman Ritual. It can only be solemnly blessed.

A Rabid Protestant Brazilian Missionary.—Those who read the Catholic newspapers of Latin America are often struck by the large space and energy they devote to polemics against Protestantism. We can not wonder at this if all the Protestant ministers actively engaged in missionary work in those regions are of the calibre of the Rev. J. Rockwell Smith, D. D., of Sao Paulo, Brazil, who, in an address before the Students' Volunteer Movement convention recently held at Toronto, said, according to *Mosher's Magazine* (July):

"I presume that I speak to a Protestant audience and shall not offend if I say frankly that Romanism is not Christianity."

"The religion of these lands (South America) in its practical outworking as well as in its doctrinal basis is not the religion of the Word of God ; it is not Christianity, the worship of the Son of God, but Mariolatry, the worship of His human mother. The Bible is always and everywhere withheld as far as possible from the people, not to say from the majority of the priests. The natural consequences are sacramentarianism, sacerdotalism, superstition, crass idolatry, and gross immorality. Servile homage is paid to the priests, though hated."

There is plenty more of this, but we will not quote further ; but simply hand over the Rev. Dr. Smith to the tender mercies of our excellent Catholic contemporary, *O Estandarte Catolico* of Sao Paulo.

LITERATURE.

A Life of Las Casas.—'The Life of Bartolomé de Las Casas and The First Leaves of American Ecclesiastical History.' By Rev. L. A. Dutto. B. Herder. Price $1.50.

This book, which has been favorably reviewed by several periodicals, leads us back to the beginnings of American history and furnishes a great deal of highly interesting reading. Its well-

merited recommendation should not, however, go forth without some reserves. The author has been censured for not making, at least in a preface, due reference to the sources from which he has drawn. Many events related in the book are of such moment that their authentication may be justly desired.

In fact, Father Dutto does not own to being greatly indebted to various historical writings and researches, believing that more correct information can be gathered about the first thirty years of American history from the works of Las Casas himself than from the combined writings of all his contemporaries (p. 579.) His main purpose seems to have been to give a description of the life, character, and labors of the famous "Protector of the Indians" mostly according to the latter's own writings. Thus he was enabled to dwell on the details, which as Lord Macauly says, constitute the charm of biography. But the reader must not expect to receive a comprehensive and thoroughly reliable account of the "Indian Question" which played such a prominent part in Las Casas' life. The Bishop of Chiapa has certainly deserved well of the aborigines. Unfortunately, he was lacking that happy combination of fervor and discretion regarding which St. Bernard writes: "Laudabilis, cui neutrum deest, quatenus et (caritatis) fervor discretionem erigat et discretio fervorem regat."

Even our author, though an ardent admirer of his hero, feels it his duty to restrict somewhat his eulogies. "His (Bartolomé's) zeal for the Indians perhaps betrayed him at times into exaggerating the number and the atrocities of Spanish outrages against the aborigines" (p. 577). "Constantly recurring invectives against the Spaniards in America and painting their almost every deed in the darkest colors in order to gain the reader's sympathy and commiseration for the Indians, together with a superabundance of religious and moral reflections make the work (Bartolomé's Historia) tiresome reading at times" (p. 579). On p. 410 Spain in general is credited with the preservation and civilization of not less than 35 millions of savages.

Let us add the pertinent words of the learned historian and explorer in Spanish-America, A. F. Bandelier:

"It is evident that in Spanish-America as well as everywhere else, the strict decrees of the crown in behalf of the Indian were sometimes evaded or disregarded, and the native occasionally treated with cruelty. But these instances were only exceptions, and not the rule. Las Casas in his injudicious diatribes has completely misrepresented the facts in many cases. He was an honest, but utterly impractical enthusiast, who failed to understand both the Indian and the new issue placed before that Indian through the discovery of America, and who condemned everything and everybody from the moment that they did not agree with his theories and plans. The royal decrees in favor of the Indian were numerous, and the labor bestowed by the kings of Spain and their councils on the 'Indian Question' was immense, so that it would require a special monograph of great extent in order to do justice to the subject.....No reliance can be placed upon the numerical statements concerning the so-called Spanish blood-baths, particularly none upon those of the Bishop of Chiapa, Bartolomé de Las Casas. The whole literature of that

period should be read with the same reserves with which we receive the political 'campaign literature' of the present."

Of a pamphlet written by Las Casas in 1541 Father Dutto says himself on p. 403: "It is a graphic and exaggerated (at least all writers think so) description of all the massacres, kidnapping expeditions....It was translated into Italian and into French, and soon became the stock in trade of many foreign writers who used it as an armory whence they drew their weapons to fight Spain, often unscrupulously, and by misrepresentations."

MUSIC.

New Church Music.—From Pustet and Company THE REVIEW has received a number of new musical publications, among them a 'Missa pro defunctis,' for two unequal voices and organ, by P. Griesbacher, opus 54, (score 50 cts., voice parts, 20 cts.) The work is written in the author's well-known solid, dignified, and smooth style. While it is easy of performance, it is, nevertheless, bound to produce a strong and devotional impression.

Missa 'Tota pulchra es, Maria,' primi toni, for three mixed voices and organ by Rev. W. P. H. Jansen (score 65 cts., voice parts 30 cts.) is a work which breathes preëminently the spirit of the Gregorian Chant and, consequently, of the liturgy. The reverend author is no ordinary writer. He knows how to maintain the interest by melodic and rhythmic variety and skillful imitation. The mass is particularly suited for choirs in which the treble part is sung by boys who do not have to reach higher than middle C.

'Missa Dominicalis,' for four mixed voices and organ, by Dr. Joseph Surzynski, opus 24 (score 65 cts., voice parts 30 cts.) The author evidently aimed at brilliancy, which he, no doubt, achieved, but sometimes at the expense of unity and homogeneity of style. The mass, despite its somewhat unrestful character, well repays studying and contains many effective passages.

'Litaniae SS. Cordis Jesu,' for soprano, alto, and bass (tenor ad libitum) and organ, by Joseph Meuerer, opus 22 (score 65 cts., voice parts 30 cts.) is prayerful and not difficult.

'Missa in honorem S. Caroli Borromei,' for four mixed voices à capella, by Carolo Maupai, opus 20 (score 35 cts., voice parts 30 cts.) A broad and sonorous composition. Its natural melodic flow renders it accessible even to choirs who do not sing without accompaniment.

'Missa Adoro Te,' for two voices and organ, by John Singenberger, (score, 30 cts.) The fact that this mass has reached its fifth edition is sufficient proof of its popularity.

'Missa in laudem et adorationem SSmi. Nominis Jesu,' for four mixed voices and organ, by I. Mitterer, opus 18b. (score 50 cts.) This composition was originally written for two part male chorus, but has been expanded by the author into the present form. It is an excellent example of the composer's virile style,

and its study will be found a grateful task by choir-directors and singers alike.

'Thirty-five Offertoria,' for four and five unequal voices à capella, opus 80, by Rev. M. Haller, (score $1). It is a question whether there is anything more lofty and truly spiritual to be found in the whole literature of modern church music than these "offertoria." They are the embodiment of the spirit of the liturgy as it lives in the mind and the heart of a musically highly gifted priest and with whom it has become flesh and blood. Would that these beautiful works were to resound in our cathedrals at least.

It is unnecessary to state that all the works mentioned are gotten out in the firm's handsome and substantial fashion. There is no doubt but that good paper and fine and clear engraving add attractiveness and assist the imagination in forming an adequate conception of the work in hand.

Prof. Singenberger has published an edition of his 'Oremus' for two sopranos, alto, and organ, which ought to be welcome news to our many religious congregations of women who wish to add brilliancy to their celebration of the Holy Father's jubilee. (Price, 25 cts.)

EDUCATION.

Morality in the Public Schools.—That somewhat erratic, but always interesting and frequently brilliant newspaper, the Brooklyn *Eagle*, recently gave utterance to some very sound doctrine on the subject of ethical culture. We quote from *Mosher's Magazine*, July number:

"Right and wrong in the affairs of conduct are not matters of instinct. They have to be learned just as really, in fact, as history or handicrafts. Is this knowledge being imparted to our children in any efficient way and by any efficient teachers? Is the public school doing it? Is the Church doing it? Are fathers and mothers doing it? We are compelled sadly to say no to all these queries.... The truth is, we are taking for granted a moral intelligence which does not exist. We are leaning upon it, depending upon it, trusting to it, and it is not there. Our whole machinery of education from the kindergarten up to the university is perilously weak at this point. We have multitudes of youths and young men and women who have no more intelligent sense of what is right and what is wrong than had so many Greeks of the time of Alcibiades..... The great Roman Catholic Church steadily maintains that our State system of instruction is so defective on its ethical side that she can not submit her children to its processes."

This last-quoted statement is, of course, inaccurate, as the Church, unlike the champions of the Ethical Culture movement, does not confound ethics and religion.

The *Eagle* further says:

"The great company of educators and the whole American community need to be sternly warned that if morality can not be specifically taught in the public schools without admitting religious dogma, then religious dogma may have to be taught in them. .....It will not do to say that this kind of instruction belongs

alone to the family and the Church..... We are within measurable distance of the time when society may for its own sake go on its knees to any factor which can be warranted to make education compatible with and inseparable from morality, letting that factor do it on its own terms and teach therewith whatsoever it lists. If the State can not—or will not—learn how to teach ethics without dogma, ethics will be taught all the same by a method or system to which dogma will be allowed or excused."

SCIENCE AND INDUSTRY.

To Utilize Atmospheric Electricity Without Dynamos or Chemicals.—We read in the *Northwest Review*, of Winnipeg, Manitoba, (No. 45):

"A Spanish Catholic, named Signor Figueras, a prominent engineer of Las Palmas on the Canary Islands, now announces that he has discovered a method of utilizing atmospheric electricity without chemicals or dynamos, so as to store it for use for any purpose, and a child can manage the distributing machinery. It is said that the discovery will revolutionize the preparation and distribution of electric power."

If this is true, it means the most important scientific invention of recent years,—an invention which will prove revolutionary in more ways than one.

NOTE-BOOK.

Our government continues to insist that it has no interest in the expulsion of the friars from the Philippine Islands. It wants them to get out simply and solely because "the Filipinos want them to get out." Only one secular newspaper, so far as we have observed, the New York *World*, has realized that, if true, this is an exceedingly dangerous argument which cuts both ways; for there is no doubt that the great mass of Filipinos would like our government itself to "get out."

The late Lord Acton is described by one of his admirers as "a Liberal of the orthodox type." If this type ever existed, of which we are not quite sure, we fear it has become extinct.

This is the way Mr. Root's and Mr. Taft's "victory" over the Vatican impresses the average fair-minded American:

"We are pleased to learn that Secretary Root, contrary to what we feared, has won a great 'victory' in his negotiations with the Vatican. This is carefully explained to us by the *Tribune*, which says, on page 8, that it "is not for a moment to be conceded" that the Secretary's diplomacy has been "defeated." To prove the case up to the hilt, it prints on page 3 the pictures of two of the three Cardinals who "are held responsible for the failure of negotiations over the friars' lands." Just carefully define your term

"victory," so as to make it synonymous with "failure," and you may go on your way rejoicing. What has seemed ludicrous to us in the whole affair was the lofty and condescending air with which we told the Vatican what we wanted, and the calm confidence we had that it would be granted over night. We went about the business quite in the *de-haut-en-bas* manner of Lord Cranborne, who proudly declared, the other day, "Great Britain does not ask treaties, she grants them." Balfour made him apologize for the indiscretion. There is no occasion for an apology from any of Mr. Root's trumpeting friends, but a season of quiet meditation would do them good." [N. Y. *Evening Post*, July 18th.]

From Mr. Bryan's *Commoner*, edition of July 18th:

"The town of Herkimer, N. Y., enjoys the distinction of having a clergyman for president of its board of trade. Rev. James H. Halpin, a Catholic priest, engaged so actively and effectively in behalf of the business interests of Herkimer, securing by his own efforts many new industries for the town, that he was chosen president of Herkimer's Board of Trade. Father Halpin has been a priest for the last twenty years and for seventeen years has resided at Herkimer."

"Up-to-date," isn't it?

An "evangelist" is going about in Illinois offering to "work" on these terms: "Forty dollars a week and fifty conversions guaranteed or money refunded." The laborer is worthy of his hire. But isn't this quoting of salvation in the market at eighty cents per soul as if it were a merchantable commodity like anthracite coal, steel rails or cucumber pickles, a bit incongruous? Think of putting a money price upon a human soul!

Mr. Hugh J. Carroll takes the slanderers of the Philippine friars by the throat in challenging them, in a letter to the New York *Sun*, to prove a single one of their stories of immorality. He tells them that "there is a standing reward of $1,000 for every case of the kind mentioned by them which they can prove," and invites them to "send the evidence right over the Bridge to the International Catholic Truth Society, Arbuckle Building, Fulton street, Brooklyn, and collect the 'stuff.'"

The editor of the *Western Watchman*, who poses as the infallible guide of his Catholic brethren, wrote in his issue of June 26th: "The Pope has cheerfully accepted all the conditions of the American note in the matter of the Philippine Friars and their lands. This will be sad news to some of our Catholic papers."

Three weeks later came the cablegram announcing that the Pope had politely but most decisively refused to accept the conditions of that American diplomatic note. This sort of thing has happened so often that one wonders how so inaccurate an editor gets anyone to believe him.

"Father Lambert's recent humorous defence of him"—observes

the *Northwestern Review* (No. 25), which points out this new incongruity—"may help to explain the mystery. Editor Phelan is an *enfant terrible*, a 'child of a hundred years,' whose most solemn asseverations are of themselves worthless."

The editor of a weekly paper in Christian County, Ill., intends to bring the Bible home to his subscribers by publishing it in installments. His paper is not a large one, and the weekly installments will be short, so that it will take fifty years to get from Genesis to Revelation. It seems the people of Christian County have bibles, but do not read them. The Assumption editor's plan of bringing the Holy Writ to their notice is ingenious. But will those who do not read the Bible in book form, peruse it chapter by chapter as a newspaper *feuilleton?* We doubt it.

Since the introduction of the "Keeley cure" the theory has gained ground that drunkenness is not a crime, but a disease, and that its cure requires the physician rather than the clergyman, medicinal rather than moral remedies. As Dr. Cordley points out in the *Independent* (No. 2799), this sounds very plausible, but is very shallow, because it misses the main part of the question altogether. "It is no new thing that drunkenness is a disease. Temperance writers have long made this one of their chief indictments against the liquor habit. Its great peril was that it created a disease which was beyond a man's control. The use (we should say abuse) of alcohol produced a diseased condition of the system which craved indulgence and made it more and more difficult to break away from the habit. The craving was a disease, the (intemperate) indulgence of it was a crime. It was a misfortune to be possessed of such a craving. But it was a crime to create it, and it is a crime to indulge it. It is none the less a crime because it is a disease. It is a crime to create a disease, or to foster one. When any one asks, Is intemperance a disease or a crime? we may readily reply: It is both a disease and a crime."

The *Catholic Citizen* (No. 38) announces that it is not likely that Archbishop Katzer will, as was recently rumored, get an auxiliary bishop of Polish nationality.

Speaking of hot-weather sermons, a Methodist preacher in Atlantic, Mich., has set the pace for his colleagues every where. Twice requested on one Sunday by prominent members of his congregation, to make his evening sermon brief on account of the heat, he prepared one which he thought would be satisfactory. When he arose to announce his text, he remarked that he had twice been asked to make his sermon short and would try to do so. If this should seem too long, he would stop next time with the text. Then he delivered this sermon:

"Text, Luke 16-24: 'And he cried and said: Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of

his finger in water and cool my tongue, for I am tormented in this flame.'

"Three persons—Abraham, Dives, Lazarus. It was hot where Dives was. He did not like it. He wanted to get out. So do we. Let us pray!"

The new Prefect of the Propaganda, His Eminence Cardinal Girolamo Gotti, is—*horribile dictu*—a "monk." What a grievous disappointment his unexpected nomination must have proved to those American Catholics who had fondly hoped the Holy Father would put "a man of liberal ideas," as for instance Serafino Vannutelli, in the late Cardinal Ledochowski's important place.

Archbishop Ireland's recent pronouncement on the friar question in the Philippines has drawn the severest kind of criticism even from many of his friends. Father M. J. Gallagher, in an open letter to the Grand Rapids *Herald*, calls the great "Pauline Prelate" a "scolding cyclone." This is hardly an improvement on the "consecrated blizzard."

The President of the Centro Catolico at Manila, representing six million Filipino Catholics, spent $53 the other day in wiring to Bishop Richter of Grand Rapids that the Catholics of the Philippine Islands wish to keep the friars.

Archbishop Ireland's views with regard to the religious orders were condemned in the papal letter on Heckerism, miscalled "Americanism," writes an American priest of Irish extraction, and his opinions on the school question and on secret societies were also rejected by Rome. With this record as an interpreter of the Pope's mind it can not cause surprise if some Catholics refuse to accept him as an oracle on the Philippine question.

Msgr. Ireland's recent declaration: "The Pope teaches Catholics to trust the American government," is thus complemented by one of his most devoted journalistic servitors, the editor of the Milwaukee *Catholic Citizen* [No. 38]: "And our training as Americans teaches us to watch it closely to see that our trust is not mistaken."

Chinese is the hardest of all languages to learn, and surely by and by a phonetic Romanized alphabet will supersede the current characters in both Chinese and Japanese. A Protestant missionary, Rev. Wm. N. Brewster, of Hing-hua, South China, is devoting himself to the task with great diligence. Using his new alphabet, it is stated in the *Independent*, two village farmer boys learned to read anything at sight in a week. But they were unusually bright. It generally takes from three to six months of leisure time for working people to learn to read Romanized Chinese.